{In Archive} Fw: More info

Jose Torres to: Larry Wright, Philip Dellinger, Ray Leissner 06/30/2008 12:19 PM

From: Jose Torres/R6/USEPA/US
To: Larry Wright/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Dellinger/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Ray Leissner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

Additional information from Mr. Krueger of Goliad County

----- Forwarded by Jose Torres/R6/USEPA/US on 06/30/2008 12:21 PM -----

"Mark Krueger" <markkrueger@wildblue.net>
06/27/2008 07:31 AM

To Jose Torres/R6/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
Subject More info

Mr. Torres,

I'm attaching two more correspondence letters. One of them is a reply by Teo Saenz, a land owner in Kingsville. The other is a comment by Dr. Abitz directed to myself and Tim Andruss, General Manager, Victoria County Groundwater Conservation District. This email also contains Dr. Abitz' qualifying resume'.

I hope this is helpful.

Mark Krueger
939 Noll Road
Meyersville, Texas 77974
(361) 485-1910

----- Message from "Richard Abitz" <rabitz@cinci.rr.com> on Wed, 7 Nov 2007 11:29:12 -0500 -----

To: "'Mark Krueger'" <markkrueger@wildblue.net>, <tim.andruss@vcgcd.org>

Subject: Meeting on in situ uranium mining

Mark & Tim:

I have enclosed my resume for your review. Please note that I oppose ISL activity on the Navajo Nation lands because it would destroy their drinking water. I am not opposed to mining, as we are all in need of mining to continue our technology-based civilization.

ISL mining is fine when the groundwater surrounding the ore deposit is not fit for human or livestock consumption. There are many nuances associated with determining the baseline water quality, and this is where independent oversight of the mining companies comes into play. There are also problems associated with leaking pipes on the surface and dispersal of radioactive salts from evaporation ponds. However, if done properly, these problems can be mitigated with little harm to the environment. I could talk for hours on ISL mining, but it would be best to know your specific questions.

The cost to fly from Cincinnati to Corpus Christi (I assume this is the closest airport?) is about $550 for a

three-week-in-advance ticket. A rental car would be about $50/day (all taxes and fees), and I assume I would need the car for about three days. Therefore, travel expenses would be about $700.

Please feel free to call me to discuss ISL mining or potential travel plans.

Rich
513 226-5329

----- Message from "Kenneth Schustereit" <kenneths@awesomenet.net> on Tue, 13 Nov 2007 10:20:49 -0500 -----

To: "Katherine Nelson" <KNELSON@tceq.state.tx.us>
cc: <markkrueger@wildblue.net>, <marutherford@sbcglobal.net>, "Purple Person" <purple1@awesomenet.net>
Subject: Fw: Goliad Project Permit # UR03075

Kathryn,
Do you get it yet? Will your college education allow you to stoop so low as to use a little common sense?
Kenneth

----- Original Message -----
From: Teo Saenz
To: Kenneth Schustereit
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2007 7:28 PM
Subject: Re: Goliad Project Permit # UR03075

Kenneth,
We had 3 water wells tested in Garcia Hill in Kleberg County by URI in 05/21/1987 before a great number of test wells were drilled. The water data (taken by URI) showed Uranium levels of .05, .08, and .05. (before test wells). After a great number of test wells were drilled, the urnaium levels in 1997 were 0.176. EPA found levels of 15 picocuries per liter in 2004 and EPA told the residents to not drink the water. I have made the same argument that Mark is making to TCEQ and EPA and nothing has been done. If you add oxygen to the water via massive exploratory drilling, it makes sense that uranium will be oxidized if become soluble.
Thought this might help.

Thanks
Teo Saenz
Kingsville, Texas
esaenz@the-i.net

----- Original Message -----
From: Kenneth Schustereit
To: teo saenz ; marutherford@sbcglobal.net ; Purple Person ; greg harman ; Greg Ellis ; sherryholm@victoriaedc.org
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2007 10:53 PM
Subject: Fw: Goliad Project Permit # UR03075

----- Original Message -----
From: Mark Krueger
To: 'Art Dohmann' ; dmarkmeek@yahoo.com ; 'Kenneth Schustereit' ; kjanak@vctx.org ;

'Richard Abitz' ; tim.andruss@vcgcd.org ; mckenzie@sandramckenzie.com ; jbb@blackburncarter.com
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2007 9:57 PM
Subject: FW: Goliad Project Permit # UR03075

From: Mark Krueger [mailto:markkrueger@wildblue.net]
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2007 9:49 PM
To: 'knelson@tceq.state.tx.us'
Subject: Goliad Project Permit # UR03075

Kathryn,

I'd like to introduce myself. My name is Mark Krueger. I happen to be Bob Krueger's cousin, but that's not why I'm writing you.

It's my understanding that when the Texas Railroad Commission approves an exploratory permit (specifically uranium), the permit allows the mining company to explore by drilling hundreds of holes into the ground in a relatively small area. It's also my understanding that the exploratory drilling does not require prerequisite water quality testing.

Once the exploratory drilling is complete, the mining company then takes water samples to establish a baseline, which will normally show that the water is "not fit for human consumption", and this is the basis for EPA, TCEQ and UIC to approve a mining permit.

I don't mean to sound elementary, but doesn't it seem logical that if one were to stick a blender down into the ground, times hundreds, that the aggravated water may be less than optimal for drinking? Let's take two glasses of drinking water, and drop a "precipitated" element into both of them. Let's call the precipitated mass a "dirt clod". There may be some residual effect from the dirt clod, but the water will still remain drinkable, as long as the clod is not disturbed. After a substantial period of time, the sediment should totally come to rest, and the state of the water will be very close to its original state. Now, let's take glass #2, and put a drill bit down into it and turn the drill on. It will disturb the dirt clod, and turn the surrounding water into mud. I would consider the mud "not fit for human consumption", as I'm sure the EPA would consider it the same.

How can the EPA, the TCEQ and the State of Texas allow a mining company to disturb an aquifer to an extreme degree, then subsequently take water quality samples and state that the water is "not fit for human consumption"? Is it not comprehensible that the physical disturbance of a single sample well would alter the water quality, and to drill hundreds of holes would alter much of the surrounding groundwater? I am positive that if I were to run a water hose down into my well, circulating the water over

and over, that my water properties would change. I wouldn't have to inject hydrogen peroxide or any other lixiviate into the water to get it to produce increased mineral levels. If I were to put an auger down into my water well, and rotate it thousands of times, I'm sure that my water quality would be less than optimal, and probably "not fit for human consumption".

It appears that the Texas Railroad Commission allows such an act, being the permissive disturbance of underground water, prior to obtaining water quality samples from that aquifer. The water samples taken and tested for drinking water quality have then been manufactured, disturbed to the point of non-drinkablility. This is absolutely absurd.

I live less than five miles from the Uranium Energy Corporation's proposed Goliad Project site. My family and I live hydrologically degradient from the site. We had our water tested, as did seventeen of my rural neighbors, by the Texas Department of Health Services in Austin. All of our water is drinkable, and most of our wells are in "third sand". The report recorded with SEDAR, regarding the Goliad Project, reflects the opinion that the first sand is "nonconfined", but that the second, third and fourth sands are "confined". The confining clay and silt are above and below each defined unit.

My water well is 185 feet deep, in the third sand. If there are only confining clay/silt barriers above and below, dividing each sand layer, then what is to keep contaminated water from flowing laterally to my water well?

I'm neither a hydrologist nor a hydrogeologist, but the State's approach to establishing a water quality baseline in the ore body of an aquifer after it has been disturbed is absurd. The Texas Railroad Commission MUST require a prerequisite water quality testing system PRIOR to the exploratory drilling. Any water testing subsequent to the exploratory drilling is "manufactured", and is not an accurate representation of the natural water quality.

I'll be traveling to Austin in the near future to address this issue at the Capitol Building. I hope to be able to visit with you and your colleagues at that time.

Sincerely,

Mark Krueger
939 Noll Road
Meyersville, Texas 77974
(361) 485-1910
markkrueger@wildblue.net
www.goliadproject.com

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.503 / Virus Database: 269.15.27/1121 - Release Date: 11/9/2007 7:29 PM